



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Alfred Hillebrandt. *Ritual-Literatur. Vedische Opfer und Zauber.* Being volume III, part 2 of *Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* (*Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research*), edited by GEORG BÜHLER. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1897.

The philological status of no less than six important sections of the Indo-European community of peoples has been summarized, or is being summarized, by groups of competent scholars. Greek and Latin philology took the lead, and Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft* stimulated the production of no less than four other 'Grundrisse,' all of which were undertaken by the enterprising firm of Trübner in Strassburg: one of Germanic philology, edited by Hermann Paul; another of Romance philology, edited by Gustav Gröber; next that of Iranian philology, edited by Wilhelm Geiger and Ernst Kuhn; and finally one of Hindu philology, in so far as it concerns the 'Aryan' peoples of India, edited by the eminent Vienna Indologist, Professor Georg Bühler, with the aid of about thirty scholars, German, Austrian, English, Dutch, American, Indian (both native and Anglo-Indian). Thus far there have appeared, in addition to the work at the head of this notice, the parts containing Speyer's *Vedic and Sanskrit Syntax*, Bühler's *Indian Palaeography*, Jolly's *Laws and Customs* (*Recht und Sitte*), Macdonell's *Vedic Mythology*, Garbe's *Sāmkhya and Yoga Philosophy*, and Kern's *Manual of Indian Buddhism*. These treatises exhibit fairly the scope of the work which proposes to deal with the languages, literatures, history, religion, laws and customs, science and art of the Aryan Hindus. Of the more important Indo-European philologies, Indian philology is the most recent, and stands in need of concinnate treatment. Indeed, rather more than half of the subjects outlined in the prospectus have never before precipitated themselves from out of the amorphous state of article and dissertation into a connected form of treatment. The freshness of the subjects had invited in the past rather the edition and elucidation of the difficult texts, the statement of strong, salient, interesting points, and the striking of the paths that were to be the familiar exercise-ground of the enquirer. Of this there is still a vast deal to do. We need but mention the gaps in the list of even the first editions of important texts; but there is plenty of good timber for the rearing of a provisional house. The present work is timely and being executed by strong and deft hands. The Sanskritist by profession, as he glances over the compact pages of these encyclopedic treatises, realizes that his knowledge has been enlarged and the basis of his researches broadened; were there nothing but the sifted bibliographies in orderly array, which are one of the regular requirements of each contribution, these treatises would not have been written in vain.

But if we mistake not, this series is destined to exercise an unusual amount of influence in broadening and solidifying historical and institutional sciences in general. India, on account of the singular nature of her literary tradition, is destined to remain a very permanent source of knowledge, as indeed she has in the past proved herself to be the originator of important branches of historical and institutional science. The compara-

tive absence of disturbance from the outside has ensured her continuous development with little foreign admixture; her own unrivalled systematic presentations in formal treatises of her religions, laws and customs have preserved a relatively perfect and unbroken record of that development. India is largely responsible for the new so-called Science of Religions which is at this moment profoundly and wholesomely modifying men's minds in their views of religion and philosophy. Students of comparative and historical jurisprudence have also been long accustomed to turn in the same direction for materials and for organic correlation of the tissue and bones of law. Professor Jolly's work, 'Recht und Sitte,' catalogued above, offers an invaluable digest of Hindu law, and points the way in the intricate maze of native literature, and now Professor Hillebrandt's contribution distinctly, for the first time, assembles and summarizes the exceedingly systematic and painfully painstaking Vedic treatises on home-life and house-customs, on the ritualistic practices of the Brahmans, and on witchcraft, incantation, exorcism and superstitions in general.

No student of India will say that a more ideally competent scholar than Professor Hillebrandt could have been called to this particular task. He is to begin with an all-round Vedic scholar of the first rank. But his special qualification is found in his prolonged, patient studies of the so-called *Ārauta*-literature, the literature of the great Vedic sacrifices, having himself edited one of the most important texts of that class, the *Ānkhāyana-Ārautasūtra*, and having elaborated a number of connected treatises on special phases of this literature—witness, e. g., his essays on the New-moon and Full-moon sacrifice, on the Solstitial Festivals (*Sonnwendfeste*), and others. His sketch, as he modestly calls it, of the contents of the *Ārautasūtras* (pp. 97–166), though based to a considerable extent on Professor Weber's pioneer labor in the same field (*Zur Kenntniss des Vedischen Opferrituals*, *Indische Studien*, X and XII), is the *pièce de resistance* of the entire work. To this Vedic scholars will turn most frequently for information on the literature of the subject, for guidance through the intricate performances of the numerous priests, for explanation of the well-nigh countless technical terms, and for correlation, where possible, of these rigid technical performances with the living world; in other words, for an account of their development out of popular (ethnological) needs and beliefs.

One wish connected with this very part of the work is not easily suppressed. The general plan of the series follows the native division of the Vedic literature into revealed texts (*śruti*) and traditional texts (*smṛti*). This division is both mythical and unpractical, and it is to be regretted that it has been introduced at all. Mantra and Brāhmaṇa (*śruti*), as far as their subject-matter is concerned, are not nearly so closely allied as Brāhmaṇa and *Ārautasūtra* (*smṛti*). The separation of the last two is in reality impossible. Professor Geldner has in charge the *śruti* of the three Vedas, and, if we mistake not the temper and the trend of his previous investigations, he will deal with the Brāhmaṇas of the three Vedas from the point of view of literary history rather than from the point of view of ritualistic

detail. The character of the Brāhmaṇas as a mixture of sacrificial prescript with legendary illustration—*hallacha* and *haggada*, as they are called in the Talmudic systematic view—is likely to engage his attention and to preempt the space allotted to him so much that he will lack the opportunity to present a complete sketch of the various sacrifices as treated in the Brāhmaṇas with any detail whatsoever. Indeed, were he, after all, to do this, he would be doing over again what Professor Hillebrandt has done so excellently upon the basis of the closely allied Çrāutasūtras. It is not unlikely that this encyclopedia will pass into subsequent editions: would it be too much, then, to ask Professor Hillebrandt to take courage and break down the artificial barrier, and to treat each çrāuta-sacrifice both in its Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra form? At least he might add to his citations, without great trouble to himself and without the need of great additional space, the places in the voluminous Brāhmaṇas in which each sacrifice is treated, even though he restricted himself, in the main, to his original expositions in the first edition.

The entire work is divided into four parts. The first deals with the beginnings, the literary sources, and the significance of the ritual practices; the second with the practices of home-life (Gṛhyasūtras); the third with the Vedic sacrifice (Çrāutasūtras); and the fourth with Vedic witchcraft. All four are products of scholarship so profound and judgment so nice as to leave one well satisfied that this compact treatise presents a picture whose general outline will never be altered materially. A little more breadth might have been desirable for the last chapter. The literature of Hindu superstition is so extensive, it is so largely dominated by transparent symbolism and by concomitant explanatory circumstances as to ensure for it that same basic importance in general ethnology and folklore which confessedly belongs to Hindu religion, law and house-customs. The subject of omens and portents alone¹ would justify an independent treatise, as would also the subject of Vedic physiology, anatomy and medicine. But even in these matters a gratifying beginning has been made.

A few details may be added to this notice. P. 36, l. 4: the *çāunakayajña* is after all not original with the Vāitāna-sūtra, since it is found also KB. iv. 6; ÇÇ. 3. 10. 7; AÇ. 9. 7. 1. But its correlation with the *abhicārakāma* remains interesting as illustrating the probably apocryphal name of the redactor of the vulgate version of the AV.—On the same page near the end the author Upavarṣa must be identical with the one mentioned JAOS. XI 376; Kāuṣika, Introduction, p. xvii.—On the same page, note 1, the Yajñaprāyaścittasūtra is doubtless identical with the six prāyaścittādhyāyas of the Vāit.; see Garbe, Introduction to his edition of that text, p. v; Weber, Verzeichniss der Sanskrit-Handschriften, vol. II, p. 83.—P. 41 (cf. also p. 71): for the division of the sacrifice into *pākayajña*, etc., see Gop. Br. i. 5. 7, and 23.—P. 64, middle: for an attempt to explain the so-called Indrāpī-rite as a practice to prevent the death of a husband and consequent widowhood, see the present writer, ZDMG. XLVIII 553, note 2.—P. 76,

¹ Add to the literature on the subject (p. 184) Hatfield's treatment of the Āuṇasādbhūtāni (JAOS. XV, pp. 207 ff.), and the abdhuta-texts at the end of Atharva-Pariçīṣṭas.

bottom: Çveta of course is = Pāidva, the white horse of Pedu that kills serpents from the time of the RV. on.—P. 80, l. 10: the practice of slaughtering a cow in honor of a guest (obviously obsolescent in the Gr̥hyasūtras) is embalmed in the Vedic proper name Atithigva; see AJP. XVII, pp. 424 ff.—On the same page, middle: To the practices connected with the building of a house add the so-called *çyenayāga* or *çyenejyā*, unearthed by the present writer, JAOS. XVI, pp. 12 ff.—P. 90, middle: for a somewhat more precise explanation of the word *çrāddha* see AJP. XVII 411.—P. 169, middle: see SBE. XLII, pp. 20 ff.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

Sophokles Elektra. Erklärt von GEORG KAIBEL. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1896.

The new Teubner *Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu griechischen u. römischen Schriftstellern* challenges attention by its title and still more by its programme. No concession is to be made to practical needs. The commentaries are to address themselves to mature scholars, and consequently invite the most rigorous scrutiny. To teach teachers is a perilous task, and the publishers have made a wise selection in the editor of the first commentary, and the editor a wise selection in the choice of his text. Apart from his long and close association with Wilamowitz, KAIBEL's independent work would lead us to expect a penetrating treatment of his author, and the Elektra of Sophokles is just the play to bring out the value of the principles that KAIBEL advocates. By a rare kindness of fortune we are able to compare the dramatic methods of the three great coryphaei of Attic tragedy in handling the same theme, and interpretation necessarily plays a conspicuous part in the Elektra. True, textual criticism will never cease from troubling, but exegesis must come to the front when so many problems of tragic psychology are involved as one finds in this play of Sophokles. "Exhaust interpretation before you attack the text" is a wise rule of a great teacher, but, unfortunately, the interpreter too often becomes exhausted before the interpretation and conjectural criticism is summoned to the relief. To be sure, what is sometimes called conjecture is not, properly speaking, conjecture. It is a manner of proof-reading for which modern slaves of the vernacular press take no credit to themselves, as every man that has served in the humble capacity of reader makes daily 'emendations' that would be the fortune of some scholars, if the operations were performed on the body of the classic texts. It is purely a matter of familiarity with the range of thought and expression, and is less a wonder, the more one is at home in a given language. Indeed, it is very questionable whether Hellenists of the old time plumed themselves so much on their corrections as do men of our day, and the praises that have been showered on some of Reiske's work in that line would doubtless have astonished that large-limbed scholar himself. But a homily on the abuses of conjectural criticism would be sadly out of place in a review of KAIBEL's Elektra, for in the very first lines of his prelimi-